

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_130091
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative GC-MS Analysis of the Chemical Profile of Beans (Phaseolus vulgaris): Impact of Sniper (Dichlorvos) Contamination and Cooking Methods
Type of the Article	Research article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community due to its comprehensive analysis of the chemical profiles of beans subjected to different treatments. It provides valuable insights into the presence of both beneficial natural components and harmful contaminants in the beans, shedding light on potential health implications. The identification of toxic substances in the beans raises awareness about food safety and quality, emphasizing the need for stringent post-harvest practices and improved monitoring of pesticide use in agricultural produce.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The article effectively addresses the critical issue of pesticide contamination in black-eyed beans, providing a thorough analysis of the health implications associated with such contaminants. The use of GC-MS for chemical profiling is commendable, as it offers detailed insights into both beneficial and harmful compounds present in the beans. However, the manuscript could benefit from a more extensive discussion on potential decontamination methods and practical recommendations for farmers and consumers. Additionally, clearer organization and presentation of results would enhance readability and comprehension for the audience.</p> <p>Improving data visualization through the use of charts, graphs, or tables would help present key findings more clearly, making it easier for readers to understand the implications of pesticide contamination? Incorporating real-world case studies that illustrate successful interventions in managing pesticide use and contamination would further enrich the content.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sowmya K.L.
Department, University & Country	Davangere University, India